

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Revised 8/13/04

DISTRICT OFFICE: Omaha District CENWO-OD-RMT (Billings)
FILE NUMBER: 2005-90-213

PROJECT LOCATION INFORMATION:

State: Montana
County: Hill
Center coordinates of site (latitude/longitude): Sec. 2, T2N, R15E
Approximate size of area (parcel) reviewed, including uplands: 13 acres.
Name of nearest waterway: Beaver Creek
Name of watershed: HUC 10050004

JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION

Completed: Desktop determination ☐ Date:
Site visit(s) ☒ Date(s): 6/7/05

Jurisdictional Determination (JD):

- ☐ Preliminary JD - Based on available information, ☐ *there appear to be* (or) ☐ *there appear to be no* "waters of the United States" and/or "navigable waters of the United States" on the project site. A preliminary JD is not appealable (Reference 33 CFR part 331).
- ☒ Approved JD - An approved JD is an appealable action (Reference 33 CFR part 331).
Check all that apply:
- ☐ *There are* "navigable waters of the United States" (as defined by 33 CFR part 329 and associated guidance) within the reviewed area. Approximate size of jurisdictional area: .
- ☐ *There are* "waters of the United States" (as defined by 33 CFR part 328 and associated guidance) within the reviewed area. Approximate size of jurisdictional area: .
- ☒ *There are* "isolated, non-navigable, intra-state waters or wetlands" within the reviewed area.
☒ Decision supported by SWANCC/Migratory Bird Rule Information Sheet for Determination of No Jurisdiction.

BASIS OF JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION:

A. Waters defined under 33 CFR part 329 as "navigable waters of the United States":

- ☐ The presence of waters that are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide and/or are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.

B. Waters defined under 33 CFR part 328.3(a) as "waters of the United States":

- ☐ (1) The presence of waters, which are currently used, or were used in the past, or may be susceptible to use in interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.
- ☐ (2) The presence of interstate waters including interstate wetlands¹.
- ☐ (3) The presence of other waters such as intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds, the use, degradation or destruction of which could affect interstate commerce including any such waters (check all that apply):
- ☐ (i) which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.
- ☐ (ii) from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
- ☐ (iii) which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.
- ☐ (4) Impoundments of waters otherwise defined as waters of the US.
- ☐ (5) The presence of a tributary to a water identified in (1) - (4) above.
- ☐ (6) The presence of territorial seas.
- ☐ (7) The presence of wetlands adjacent² to other waters of the US, except for those wetlands adjacent to other wetlands.

Rationale for the Basis of Jurisdictional Determination (applies to any boxes checked above). *If the jurisdictional water or wetland is not itself a navigable water of the United States, describe connection(s) to the downstream navigable waters. If B(1) or B(3) is used as the Basis of Jurisdiction, document navigability and/or interstate commerce connection (i.e., discuss site conditions, including why the waterbody is navigable and/or how the destruction of the waterbody could affect interstate or foreign commerce). If B(2, 4, 5 or 6) is used as the Basis of Jurisdiction, document the rationale used to make the determination. If B(7) is used as the Basis of Jurisdiction, document the rationale used to make adjacency determination:* Project is located within wetlands that are adjacent to a man-made ditch that flows through a culvert into Beaver Creek. The ditch has no ordinary high water mark and no continuum of wetlands. Therefore, the wetlands are not jurisdictional because the connecting channel is not jurisdictional.

Lateral Extent of Jurisdiction: (Reference: 33 CFR parts 328 and 329)

- ☐ Ordinary High Water Mark indicated by:
- ☐ clear, natural line impressed on the bank
 - ☐ the presence of litter and debris
 - ☐ changes in the character of soil
 - ☐ destruction of terrestrial vegetation
 - ☐ shelving
 - ☐ other:
- ☐ High Tide Line indicated by:
- ☐ oil or scum line along shore objects
 - ☐ fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore)
 - ☐ physical markings/characteristics
 - ☐ tidal gages
 - ☐ other:
- ☐ Mean High Water Mark indicated by:
- ☐ survey to available datum; ☐ physical markings; ☐ vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types.
- ☐ Wetland boundaries, as shown on the attached wetland delineation map and/or in a delineation report prepared by:

Basis For Not Asserting Jurisdiction:

- ☐ The reviewed area consists entirely of uplands.
- ☐ Unable to confirm the presence of waters in 33 CFR part 328(a)(1, 2, or 4-7).
- ☐ Headquarters declined to approve jurisdiction on the basis of 33 CFR part 328.3(a)(3).
- ☒ The Corps has made a case-specific determination that the following waters present on the site are not Waters of the United States:
- ☐ Waste treatment systems, including treatment ponds or lagoons, pursuant to 33 CFR part 328.3.
 - ☐ Artificially irrigated areas, which would revert to upland if the irrigation ceased.
 - ☐ Artificial lakes and ponds created by excavating and/or diking dry land to collect and retain water and which are used exclusively for such purposes as stock watering, irrigation, settling basins, or rice growing.
 - ☐ Artificial reflecting or swimming pools or other small ornamental bodies of water created by excavating and/or diking dry land to retain water for primarily aesthetic reasons.
 - ☐ Water-filled depressions created in dry land incidental to construction activity and pits excavated in dry land for the purpose of obtaining fill, sand, or gravel unless and until the construction or excavation operation is abandoned and the resulting body of water meets the definition of waters of the United States found at 33 CFR 328.3(a).
 - ☒ Isolated, intrastate wetland with no nexus to interstate commerce.
 - ☐ Prior converted cropland, as determined by the Natural Resources Conservation Service. Explain rationale:
 - ☐ Non-tidal drainage or irrigation ditches excavated on dry land. Explain rationale:
 - ☐ Other (explain):

DATA REVIEWED FOR JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (mark all that apply):

- ☒ Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant.
- ☐ Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant.
- ☐ This office concurs with the delineation report, dated , prepared by (company):
 - ☐ This office does not concur with the delineation report, dated , prepared by (company):
- ☐ Data sheets prepared by the Corps.
- ☐ Corps' navigable waters' studies:
- ☐ U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:
- ☐ U.S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Topographic maps:
- ☐ U.S. Geological Survey 7.5 Minute Historic quadrangles:
- ☐ U.S. Geological Survey 15 Minute Historic quadrangles:
- ☐ USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey:
- ☐ National wetlands inventory maps:
- ☐ State/Local wetland inventory maps:
- ☐ FEMA/FIRM maps (Map Name & Date):
- ☐ 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (NGVD)
- ☐ Aerial Photographs (Name & Date):
- ☐ Other photographs (Date):
- ☐ Advanced Identification Wetland maps:
- ☒ Site visit/determination conducted on: 6/7/05
- ☐ Applicable/supporting case law:
- ☐ Other information (please specify):

¹Wetlands are identified and delineated using the methods and criteria established in the Corps Wetland Delineation Manual (87 Manual) (i.e., occurrence of hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils and wetland hydrology).

²The term "adjacent" means bordering, contiguous, or neighboring. Wetlands separated from other waters of the U.S. by man-made dikes or barriers, natural river berms, beach dunes, and the like are also adjacent.

INFORMATION SHEET
DETERMINATIONS OF NO JURISDICTION FOR ISOLATED, NON-NAVIGABLE, INTRA-STATE WATERS
RESULTING FROM U.S. SUPREME COURT DECISION IN SOLID WASTE AGENCY OF NORTHERN COOK
COUNTY V. U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

DISTRICT OFFICE:

Omaha

FILE NUMBER:

200590213

REGULATORY PROJECT MANAGER:

Cathy JuhasDate: June 10, 2005

PROJECT REVIEW/DETERMINATION COMPLETED:

In the office N (Y/N)

Date: _____

At the project site Y (Y/N) Date: June 7, 2005

PROJECT LOCATION INFORMATION:

State:

Montana

County:

Hill

Center coordinates of site by latitude & longitudinal coordinates:

Sec. 2, Township 2 N, Range 15 E

Approximate size of site/property (including uplands & in acres):

13

Name of waterway or watershed:

HUC 10050004

SITE CONDITIONS:

Type of aquatic resource ¹	0-1 ac	1-3 ac	3-5 ac	5-10 ac	10-25 ac	25-50 ac	> 50 ac	Linear feet	Unknown
Lake									
River									
Stream									
Dry Wash									
Mudflat									
Sandflat									
Wetlands					X				
Slough									
Prairie pothole									
Wet meadow									
Playa lake									
Vernal pool									
Natural pond									
Other water (identify type)									

¹Check appropriate boxes that best describe type of isolated, non-navigable, intra-state water present and best estimate for size of non-jurisdictional aquatic resource area.

Migratory Bird Rule Factors ¹ :	If Known		If Unknown Use Best Professional Judgment		
	Yes	No	Predicted to Occur	Not Expected to Occur	Not Able To Make Determination
Is or would be used as habitat for birds protected by Migratory Bird Treaties?				X	
Is or would be used as habitat by other migratory birds that cross state lines?				X	
Is or would be used as habitat for endangered species?		X			
Is used to irrigate crops sold in interstate commerce?		X			

¹Check appropriate boxes that best describe potential for applicability of the Migratory Bird Rule to apply to onsite, non-jurisdictional, isolated, non-navigable, intra-state aquatic resource area.

TYPE OF DETERMINATION:

Preliminary Or Approved X.

OPTIONAL ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUPPORTING NJD (e.g., discussion may include information reviewed to assess potential navigation or interstate commerce connections - 1 to 3 paragraphs):

1. Site Conditions – The proposed project is located in west Havre in Sec. 2, T2N, R15E. A preliminary wetland delineation was conducted on March 2, 2005 by Westech Environmental Services, Inc. The delineation found 2.2 acres of wetlands are present on the facility site, but are not directly connected to Beaver Creek.
2. On June 7, 2005, Cathy Juhas conducted a site visit. It was determined that the wetlands are isolated. The wetlands on the property are adjacent to a man-made ditch that flows through a culvert and eventually on to Beaver Creek. The ditch does not have an OHW mark or a continuum of wetlands. Therefore, the wetlands are not jurisdictional because the connecting channel is not jurisdictional. No boating or irrigation would be possible at any location. No fisheries are present.
3. This determination was made by reviewing quad and aerial photos of the project area, as well as the June 7, 2005 site visit.
4. There are no jurisdictional waters on the project site. This is an approved jurisdictional determination.